

just like my colleagues over the years in the course of my four Senate races, I have gained a firsthand familiarity with campaign finance issues. The Senate can take pride in this debate, while issues regarding the first amendment have been center stage, it seems to me there is another fundamental issue we should consider.

One of our aims during this great debate should be to encourage greater citizen participation in elections. Citizens are the backbone of our democracy and should be given encouragement to participate in every way in the elective process.

What are the means by which we can encourage a greater role for the average citizen? I believe one method is a \$100 tax credit for contributions made to House and Senate candidates. I propose this tax credit be available only to single persons with an adjusted gross income at or below \$50,000. For married couples, in order to avoid exacting a "marriage penalty," a married couple filing jointly could claim a total of \$200 in tax credits.

For various reasons, the wealthy are already involved in politics, but there has been a declining interest in campaigns for those at the other end of the spectrum. This credit would encourage broader participation by moderate and lower income voters to balance the greater ability of special interests to participate in the process.

There is precedent for such a tax credit. Until 1986, there was a \$50 tax credit for contributions to political campaigns. According to IRS data, when Congress repealed the political contributions tax credit, "a significant percentage of persons claiming the credit have sufficiently high incomes to make contributions in after tax dollars, without the benefit of the tax credit."

My proposal would contrast with the previous tax credit because it would cap the eligible income levels to ensure it is not exclusively the wealthy who take advantage of it.

I think this is an issue that should be addressed in this campaign finance bill. However, because of the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives, I merely bring this issue to your attention now, with the expectation I will raise it again in the context of a reconciliation bill that may be forthcoming.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, during yesterday's campaign finance debate, I referred to a number of businesses that support a campaign finance reform proposal. I meant to say that top executives or chief executive officers of those businesses support the reform proposal.

OIL EXPLORATION IN THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, and I just attended a press conference concerning exploration in the

coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In attendance were: James P. Hoffa, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Michael Sacco, Maritime Trade Department, AFL-CIO; Terry O'Sullivan, Building Trades Department; Martin J. Maddaloni, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry; Joseph Hunt, International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers; Frank Hanley, International Union of Operating Engineers; Larry O'Toole, Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; James Henry, Transportation Institute; and Michael McKay, American Maritime Officers Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by Michael Sacco of the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO be printed in the RECORD for my colleagues to read. It offers great insight into the reasons why working men and women throughout the country support oil and gas exploration in the coastal plain.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL SACCO, MTD PRESIDENT

With increasing energy problems throughout the United States, Americans are looking for new ways to meet the growing demand for energy products and ensure the continued economic expansion we have enjoyed over the past decade.

Only one location promises to help America meet its energy needs while providing good-paying jobs to American workers—the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

By opening ANWR, the United States can increase domestic oil production, reduce our reliance on foreign sources of oil, and create hundreds of thousands of new jobs for American workers.

ANWR will be explored and drilled by American workers—the oil transported through U.S.-built pipelines—refined and distributed by domestic facilities—and its by-products used by U.S. energy producers and U.S. consumers.

These jobs will help keep the economic engine of this country running.

Many of our brothers and sisters in maritime labor will crew the growing fleet of environmentally safe, double-hulled, U.S.-flagged tankers that will carry the oil from Alaska.

These vessels will be American-owned—built by Americans in American shipyards—and serviced and repaired in American yards.

In times of national emergency, the U.S. Merchant Marine is the first to enter the war zone to deliver supplies. America's military depends on the ability to project its power anywhere in the world.

That means we need sealift which is capable of quickly transporting fuel and supplies across thousands of miles.

As we learned in Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, U.S.-flag ships, American seafarers employed on those ships, and the American shipyard workers that build the vessels, are vital parts of our sealift capability.

Opening ANWR to development also will enable our U.S.-flag Merchant Marine to grow and help expand our shipyard industrial base—both of which serve valuable military purposes.

We've shown that opening ANWR will be done in a responsible, environmentally sound way.

Since the opening of Alaska's North Slope, nature and development have safely co-existed. And today's technology makes it possible to produce oil in a less-invasive and more environmentally friendly manner.

The Maritime Trades Department stands with the Building Trades, major oil producers, the business community and all the members of JobPower in calling on Congress to open ANWR.

America will benefit for years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ROWLAND EVANS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today in our Nation's Capital funeral services were held for Rowland Evans, a lifetime journalist of international acclaim. This magnificently conducted service, attend by an extraordinary gathering of family, friends, and peers, preserved forever the man's extraordinary love of family, journalism, and service to country in the uniform of the U.S. Marines in combat operations in the Pacific during World War II.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Jones, officiated in presenting the American Flag to the family to conclude this deeply moving service.

Rowland Evans was an astute observer of the values of our federal system of government, but his great fascination was with the political arena—the centerpiece being those who competed for and won or lost elective offices.

His partner—his close friend—for over a quarter of a century, Robert Novak, rose to the challenge of chronicling with sensitivity, humor and insight his many lifetime achievements.

Senator KENNEDY, Senator SNOWE, and I were privileged to be in attendance at the services at Christ's Church, Georgetown. We join in asking unanimous consent to have printed in today's RECORD the proceedings of the U.S. Senate, a complex institution, which Rowland Evans keenly understood, the eulogy by Robert Novak.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY BY MR. ROBERT NOVAK

Having spend his life in journalism writing thousands of columns and literally millions of words, Rowland Evans well knew how hard it was to get things exactly right. So it was with his well-meaning obituaries last Saturday.

The AP report said he had been in poor health for years. In truth, until diagnosed with cancer last summer, it could be said he was the healthiest 79-year-old on the planet. Even for the past nine months, he was no invalid.

His oncologist said he had never quite seen a cancer patient like Rowly Evans. Two weeks before he died he was playing squash, appearing on television, climbing the mountain at his place in Culpepper, even making a deal to finally achieve his long-time desire to buy the top of the mountain and complete ownership of it. As he entered the hospital with two days of life remaining and the bleak options were laid before him, he interrupted the doctor to talk about his chances

for presiding over the Evans-Novak political forum next week.

The headline in the New York Times called him a conservative columnist. I guess he did end up as pretty conservative—this friend and ardent admirer of Jack and Robert Kennedy, the son of a liberal Democratic family on the conservative Philadelphia mainline who, at the behest of his New Deal father, delivered a speech—in Marine uniform—for Franklin Roosevelt in 1944.

When Kay Winton told her liberal father she had fallen in love with Rowly, she concluded by saying: and, daddy, he's a liberal! Nearly half a century later, her husband was singing the praises of Ronald Reagan and Newt Gingrich.

Still I can think of words more descriptive of the whole man than conservative: reporter, patriot, mentor, competitor, even—and here using a description by his wife of 51 years—rascal.

He rejoiced in his rascality and loved to talk about it. About the time as Marine recruit at Parris Island, when he spotted an old buddy from the Kent School who was a Marine lieutenant. They decided to have a drink together, but where could an officer and an enlisted man go together? To go to the Officers Club, his friend dressed Rowly as an officer. All went well until Rowly spotted how own commanding officer at the bar. They tiptoed out to prevent their Marine careers from ending in court martial.

Most of us know the story of how Rowly, the lowest of the low in the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press, posted as bureau chief to interview Katherine for a job—at 8 o'clock in the evening, no less.

And Rowly said the crowning achievement of his life came just a few years ago when he and his friend Woody Redmond skated the frozen Potomac River before being halted—and nearly arrested—by police.

The skating incident also reflected one of the fiercest competitive spirits any of us have ever seen—playing competitive ice hockey until he was 40, winning squash tournament after squash tournament at the Metropolitan Club into his 70's and ranked nationally among senior squash players, playing tennis or bridge or poker, shooting dice with friends for lunch at the Metropolitan Club, just trying to drive from Georgetown to Culpepper without hitting a stoplight. He could recite nearly every shot of the semi-final match in the National Father-and Son Tennis Tournament when he was 14 years old.

He was a happy warrior, a delight at any dinner party, playing the piano, stirring up trouble. But beneath these high spirits burned the heart of a patriot—the Yale freshman who stood in line on December 8, 1941 to enlist in the Marine Corps, exchanging the privileged life he had always known for combat at Guadalcanal.

His fierce passion for the security of his country was the prism through which all his journalism passed. It guided his greatest journalistic achievements—his exposé of Soviet arms control cheating in the 1970's that the U.S. Government sought to hide, his informed forecasts of the fall of the communist empire in Czechoslovakia and Poland.

That passion embroiled Rowly in controversy when he refused to accept the Government cover-up of the bombing of the U.S.S. *Liberty* in the Six-day War. He could not let the reasons for the death of fellow Americans serving their country go unnoticed.

Rowland Evans was no deskbound columnist. In the tradition of his great friends the Alsop brothers, he went everywhere—and anywhere—for a story: China, Southeast Asia, all over Eastern Europe, the Mideast, the Indian subcontinent. He skirted death in

incidents in Vietnam and the Six-day War. He could not report on the independence movement in the Baltics without actually going to Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. When his father died, Rowly was reporting in Iraq—awaiting a rare interview with Saddam Hussein. He flew to Philadelphia for the funeral, then back to Baghdad—and that interview with the Iraqi dictator.

But the heart of his reporting was here in Washington. His sources were legion: the mighty of Washington and obscure staffers, CIA spooks and mysterious émigrés. All were interrogated in the dining room of the Metropolitan Club.

In the last week, I have been contacted by so many younger people in the news business who told me how Rowly counseled them, gave them a helping hand. His was what Stew Alsop called the reporter's trade and he sought to pass it along to a new generation.

If I may close with a strictly personal note. On the morning of Monday, December 17, 1963, returning to the Washington Bureau of the Wall Street Journal after my honeymoon, I found a batch of notes from a reporter form the New York Herald-Tribune whom I barely knew: Rowland Evans. When I called him, he asked me for lunch—not at the Metropolitan Club by the way but at Blackie's House of Beef. It was a lunch that changed my life and made my career.

The upshot was the Evans-Novak column which lasted for 30 years until his retirement and a partnership of 38 years that continued in television and our newsletter. We had a thousand shouting arguments, often at the top of our voices. We never fought about money, hardly ever about ideology but frequently about what story to tell and how to tell it.

Rowland Evans was the life of every party, but he ceased being a society boy long ago in the crucible of combat as a Marine sergeant in the Solomon Islands. He was a tough Marine, an unabashed patriot, a great journalist and a faithful friend and colleague. Rest in peace, Rowly.

CHAMPVA FOR LIFE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am proud to be the author of the CHAMPVA for Life Act of 2001.

Last year, Congress finally enacted legislation to restore the promise of providing lifetime health care to our military retirees. TRICARE for Life, as it is known, is long overdue. However, an equally worthy group has been left out of the reform.

The Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, CHAMPVA, provides health care coverage to several categories of individuals who have paid dearly for that right: dependents of veterans who have been rated by VA as having a total and permanent disability; survivors of veterans who died from VA-rated service-connected conditions; and survivors of servicemembers who died in the line of duty. As such, CHAMPVA provides a measure of security to a group of persons who have indisputably given a great deal to our country.

CHAMPVA is intended to serve as a safety net for dependents and survivors of severely disabled veterans who, because of their disabilities, were unable to provide health insurance benefits to their families through employment. The safety net mission of CHAMPVA

has not changed, but this law must change, since under current law, CHAMPVA beneficiaries lose their eligibility for coverage when they turn 65.

The TRICARE for Life law passed last year specifically allows military retirees and their dependents to remain in the TRICARE program after they turn age 65, as long as they are enrolled with Part B of Medicare. TRICARE will cover those expenses not covered under Medicare. It also provides for retail and mail-order pharmaceutical coverage for Medicare-eligible military retirees.

There is no doubt that TRICARE and CHAMPVA beneficiaries should retain similar eligibility for health care coverage. What TRICARE does for the families of military retirees should be no less readily available to the survivors and dependents of severely disabled veterans and those service-members who died in the line of duty. Simple justice and equity demand this. Just last week, I received a letter from a constituent from Nutter Fort, WV, that hammered home this very point. She asked in her letter, "Why aren't the CHAMPVA beneficiaries offered the same program recently approved for those on TRICARE who are now eligible for Medicare?"

Indeed, title 38 of the United States Code reflects this view by requiring the Secretary to provide medical care "in the same or similar manner and subject to the same or similar limitations as medical care furnished to certain dependents and survivors of active duty and retired members of the Armed Forces." And up until enactment of the new, highly valued TRICARE for Life provisions just last fall, the two programs were, indeed, similar.

An argument could be made that since TRICARE was modified to remove the limitation on eligibility, legislation is not necessary to equate the two programs. However, VA has not yet embraced CHAMPVA for Life.

The bill simply clarifies that the CHAMPVA and TRICARE programs should continue to operate in a similar manner, with similar eligibility. This would mean that Medicare-eligible CHAMPVA beneficiaries who enroll in Part B of Medicare would retain secondary CHAMPVA coverage, and beneficiaries would receive the same pharmacy benefit as CHAMPVA beneficiaries who are under age 65.

The failure of Congress to enact prescription drug coverage under Medicare only underscores the need to enact this CHAMPVA reform. However serious a gap it was for Medicare to lack prescription drug benefit in 1965, incredible advances in drug therapy, combined with staggering inflation in prescription drug costs, have made the need for affordable prescription drug coverage even more important today. CHAMPVA beneficiaries who have sacrificed so much already should not be forced to sacrifice anything more to purchase needed prescription drugs.

Nothing brings this closer to home for me than another letter I received